WHY PAKISTAN ?

S. RAHMAN

WITH A FOREWORD BY

The Hon. Mr. H. S. SUHRAWARDY,

B. C. L., Barrister-at-Law, Chief-Minister, Bengal.

ISLAMIC BOOK SERVICE

40—A, Urdu Bazar, Lahore

Printed at
R. Q. Printers, 25, Darbar Market, Lahore

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

[By The Hon. Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law, Chief-Minister, Bengal.]

Any reasoned book today on Pakistan, the why and the wherefore of it, is welcome. The Muslims consider that Pakistan is not only the sole solution for the ills of India, which secures independence for all and peace and co-operation and toleration, but the sole guarantee for the preservation of their religion, their culture, for their very existence as Muslims, and for their development in accordance with the genius of their nation. The Hindus as an organised body are unable to appreciate this view point ; and it is necessary from time to time to place before them material, which may help those who are open to conviction, to appreciate the moral bases of Pakistan and why the Muslims adhere so fiercely to a scheme, which the Hindus find themselves unable to adopt. We have so long, in the belief that cleavage amongst Hindus and Muslims may retard independence, stressed on unities and similarities which were but a veneer, and have

refrained from acknowledging the realities of differences. This camouflage has carried us nowhere ; it has only succeeded in evoking irreconcilable positions and made matters worse than ever. Realities when properly faced and grappled with are bound in the end to lead to permanent solutions; and this book makes an attempt to present the picture as we see it. It will repay reading, and I commend it to those who wish to know the case for Pakistan.

Calcutta,
the 3rd. April, 1946.

H. S. Suhrawardy.

of the Gandhian mind, the Muslim community thought otherwise. After the publication of the article in the journal as stated above, I received many kind congratulatory letters from my Muslim brethren.

I am really grateful to all those friends for their good-wishes ; but as space does not permit, reproducing only one such letter, which will give an idea as to the opinion of the Muslim community about my views expressed through the said article. The writer of this particular letter is a Muslim leader of all-India fame. As he was at that time an Honourable Minister of a Provincial Government, I purposely omit to mention his name. He wrote :

"......I really must congratulate you on your article. It is not only excellently worded, but it hits the nail on the head, and gives the real reason why the Hindus and Muslims are at loggerheads with each other......I wish you good luck."

The article in question has now been incorporated in the third chapter of this book and I leave it to the readers to judge whether I have really "indulged in hopeless exaggeration" or given "the real reason why the Hindus and Muslims are at loggerheads with each other."

A cutting of the article together with the above letters were placed in a drawer, where for the last six years they were rotting and I practically forgot all about them. But the other day, quite accidentally they were unearthed again. While searching for an important paper, I came across the uncared for cutting and immediately the idea struck me—'well, why should'nt I write a book on the subject ?'

That is how, I started writing this book on the night of the 8th. February last. The book is now finished and it is for the readers, again, to judge how far I have been able to present the case of Pakistan.

With the name of Allah, the fountain-head of all success, and with our national slogan Pakistan Zindabad, I conclude.

Calcutta,
the 25th February, 1946.

S. Rahman.

WHY PAKISTAN ?

I

THE MYTH OF 'UNITED INDIA'.

Pakistan, as opposed to Akhand Hindustan, is what the hundred million followers of the Prophet of Islam living in this vast sub-continent of India, are striving to achieve. The Pakistan plan, as embodied in the Lahore resolution of the Muslim League (1940), envisages separate homelands for the two great nations—the Hindus and the Muslims—inhabiting India. The resolution runs :

> "That geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the north-western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States', in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

Explaining this demand of the Muslims, Qaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the great leader of Pakistan movement in India, later on declared :

> "We want the establishment of completely independent states in the north-west and eastern zones of India and full control finally of defence, foreign affairs, communications, customs, currency and exchange etc. We do not want in any circumstances a constitution of an all-India character with one government at the centre. We will never agree to that. ...We shall never be tributaries of any power or any government at the centre so far as the north-west and eastern zones of our free national homelands are concerned."*

So, Muslims want the establishment and recognition of their independent national homelands in those parts of the country where they predominate and partition of India into Hindu and Muslim zones or, in other words, Hindustan and Pakistan States.

In the opinion of some critics, most of them Hindus, this demand for the establishment of Pakistan is impracticable and nothing but a mad dream. According to the Gandhian point of view the idea

* Presidential Address at the Madras Muslim League Session, 1941.

of Pakistan is 'sinful' and from hundreds of platforms Gandhijee's political 'heir' the 'socialist' Pundit Jawaherlal has declared that Pakistan is an impractical proposition, it will never be self-supporting and 'can not stand by itself.' Sirdar Patel has gone a step farther and declared that British Government may grant Pakistan, but the Hindus will never tolerate it and consequently this will lead to 'civil war'. This threat of 'civil war' by a highly-placed person like Sirdarjee is, perhaps, based on the arithmetical calculation that as many as three hundred millions of Hindus are inhabiting India, while the number of Muslims are only a hundred million. Only one Muslim against three Hindus ! The story of Spain can very easily be repeated in India once again !

But the Muslims are not unaware of this. They know full well that in comparison with the Hindus their strength is three to one and they will have to fight a foe numerically thrice powerful than they are. But at the same time, they also know that number does not always count and 'real' power lies in firm conviction and the determined struggle of a people for the realisation of their cherished ideal. For the Muslims, again in the words of Qaid-i-Azam himself :

> "Pakistan is no propaganda stunt. We are not playing to the gallery. Pakistan is a life and

> death question for the Mussalmans and we are firmly resolved that we must have it."*

This firm resolution of the Muslims to have their ideal—the attainment of Pakistan—has made them completely 'fear-proof' and it is sure that no amount of threats held out to them will be able to intimidate them to the least. Till their goal is reached, they will go on fighting and will, if necessary, fight to the last ditch.

Muslims are convinced that Pakistan is their birthright and they are fighting for a just cause. Critics may say, and they have already said, that 'vivisecting the country' cannot be considered to be a just cause. But are the Muslims really going to 'vivisect' the country ? They want Pakistan, that is, political recognition of their independent national homelands in those parts of the country where they predominate. In fact, we are not after creating anything new, we demand only recognition of our existing national homelands, where owing to our numerical superiority over other communities and by reason of our distinctive culture and customs, religion and law, language and literature, art and architecture, mode of living and outlook on life, our separate existence as a nation can justly be claimed.

---

*Speech at a Lahore public meeting on 14-1-46.

Then again, if there were a 'single whole', only in that case the question of 'vivisection' could be raised. But from the historical, geographical, climatic, racial, cultural, linguistic and religious points of view and from the mode of living, dress and diet India cannot, in any way, be considered to be a 'single whole'. It is not such an 'undivided whole' today, nor was it such at any time in the past. Let us examine the subject in detail point by point.

The Evidence Of History.

In the pre-historic era, before the Aryan invasion, the regions now known as India were the homelands of Dravadians, who were divided into many independent clans residing in various parts of the country. No authentic account of these Dravadian clans is available ; but in the great Hindu epics *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* names of some of these independent clans, such as, *Rakshas*, *Banara* and *Kirata* are found. *Rakshasas* were the inhabitants of *Lanka* (present-day Ceylon) and *Dandak-Bana* (Marhatta country). The mighty Ravana was their king. *Kishkindhya* (perhaps in Madras Presidency) was the homeland of *Banaras,* Bali and his brother Sugrib being their rulers. These are mentioned in the *Ramayana,* while the account of *Kiratas* are found

in the *Mahabharata*. It is stated that Arjun married a daughter of *Kirat-Raj*. In the opinion of some scholars, this kingdom of *Kirat-Raj* was situated in Assam and probably it is present-day Manipur. In the *Mahabharata* it is also stated that Bhimsen married *Hirimba*, a daughter of some *Rakshas* king. Names of some other independent kingdoms ruled by Aryan rulers are also found in both the epics. These are Kushala, Mithila, Hasthinapur, Panchal, Matsya and Dwarka etc. These accounts, though not history proper but parts of epic stories only, demonstrate full well that even in pre-historic days India was not a single political unit, but was divided into so many independent regions, each having its individuality in religious, social and economic life.

After the epic age and at the dawn of the historical era (about 600 B. C.), there were many independent kingdoms in that region alone which is now known as northern India. Of them, the names of Malab, Abanti, Batsya, Magadha, Lichchhabi, Anga, Banga. Colinga, Bideha and Kashi may be specially mentioned. In Buddhist literatures the name of Brahma Dutt, the king of Kashi, has been widely mentioned.

When Alexandar the Great invaded India in 326 B. C., he had to fight King Porus, while King

Ambhi of Taxila helped the invader. The story of Alexandar and Porus is so widely known that it is needless to mention that Porus was undoubtedly one of the many independent kings of that time.

At the time of Chandra Gupta of the Mouryya dynasty (300-184 B. C.), we find that India was divided into many independent kingdoms ; the names of Gandhar, Saurashtra (present-day Kathiwar), Magadha, Pataliputra, Kamrup, Tamralipta (present Tamluk in Bengal), Colinga, Chole, Keral and Pandya being specially mentionable of them. The position was almost the same even at the time of the great Asoke.

Samudra Gupta of the Gupta dynasty (335 A. D.) was a great hero, who conquered the kingdoms of Byaghra-Raj, Manta-Raj, Bishnu Gope and Ugra Sen. Undoubtedly these were independent kingdoms before their annexation by Samudra Gupta. There were other independent kingdoms at that time and of them the names of Kanchi, Cher, Pandya and Chole etc. in Deccan may be mentioned.

King Harshabardhan (606 A. D.) of Thaneswar conquered many independent kingdoms and it is said that 'the kingdom of Kamrup in the east and that of Ballavi in the west' had to bow down before his

might. He also invaded Deccan, but was stopped by king Pulkeshi of Chalukya. Certainly Kamrup, Ballavi and Chalukya were fully independent states. The Pal and Sen kings of Bengal were also independent monarchs at that time.

Here the Hindu period of Indian history comes to an end and Muslims enter the arena. From the instances recorded above, it will be clearly proved that there were many independent rulers scattered all over India at all stages of the Hindu period and never an 'united whole' in the sense of political domination came into being.

Mohammad bin Kasem, the first Muslim invader of India, defeated Dahir, the independent king of Sindh and conquered his kingdom in the year 712 A. D.

Sultan Mahmood of Ghazni was the second Muslim invader of this country. In 1001 A. D. he first entered India and defeated Jaipal, the then king of the territory now known as the Punjab. It is needless to point out that Jaipal was at that time an independent ruler in the land of five rivers.

Then came Maizuddin Mohammad of Ghore, who in the year 1192 A. D. defeated Prithwiraj, the independent monarch of Delhi and Ajmere. He also

conquered Kanauj and in his absence Ikhtiaruddin Mohammad bin Bakhtiar, an officer under his representative Kutubuddin Ibek, conquered Bengal in 1202 A. D. with the help of 17 horsemen only. This may be noted that Lakshman Sen, the then ruler of Bengal, was an independent king.

In or about the year 1296 A. D. Alauddin Khilji conquered the Marhatta kingdom, where king Ram Chandra Deva was ruling at that time. He also conquered Gujrat in 1297 A. D. and some years after, Chittor, the capital of Mewar, was also taken. His able general Malik Kafoor defeated Raja Protap Rudra Deva of Warangal and King Bir Ballal of Dura-Samudra (present-day Mysore).

When the famous Mohammad bin Tughlak was on the throne of Delhi, the independent Bahmani kingdom of Deccan was established in the year 1347 A. D. and Bengal was also declared independent in 1339 A. D. After that for a long time Bengal was under these independent local Sultans.

Later on, the Bahmani kingdom was split into five fully independent monarchies and these were named Ahmadnagar, Bijapur, Golkunda, Bidar and Berar. The rulers of all these five states were Muslims. Bijoynagar was another independent kingdom of

Deccan at that time, where Hindu Rajas were ruling.

After that we come to the Mughal period. When Akbar was on the throne of the Great Mughals, Mewar was conquered in 1568 A. D. Gujrat (1572-73), Bengal (1576), Kashmir (1586); Orissa (1592), Ahmadnagar (1600) and Khandesh (1601) were also conquered and annexed by this great emperor. This may be pointed out that all these conquered territories were taken from fully independent rulers.

Emperor Shah Jahan conquered Gulkunda and Bijapur in the year 1636 A. D. Both these kingdoms were independent up to that time. Alamghir Aurangzeb, the last of the powerful Mughal emperors, accumulated and left the biggest Empire, to be split into so many independent fragments later on. In fact, with the death of Alamghir the decline of the Mughal power started.

Records cited above show that, as in the Hindu period, there were always so many independent states in India at the time of Muslim rule also. Even the Great Mughals were unsuccessful in their attempts to unify the whole of India into a single political unit.

Britishers became masters of this country since 1757, when the farce of a fight took place at the

battle-field of Plassey and Sirajuddowla, the then independent Nawab of Bengal, lost his throne and later on life too For about two hundred years the Britishers are trying their best to create a great Indian Empire under one central authority: But what is the result of these attempts towards centralisation ? Has India become an 'undivided whole' under the great British-Raj ? The answer is an emphatic No. We find two fully independent sovereign states inside the boundary of India even today. These are Nepal and Bhutan. Not to speak of the Central Indian Authority at Delhi, even the British Parliament has no power over these two Indian sovereign states.

Beside these, there are as many as 600 Native States, covering about one-third of India, with ruling Princes over them. For all practical purposes, these States are fully independent in internal affairs and, in no way, they are under the Central Indian Government. Then, there are French India and Portuguese India, where two foreign powers, other than the Britishers, are ruling. And there are the Provinces, where autonomy with regards to internal affairs is being increasingly introduced. Where the position is such, how can you say that politically India is only one unit ? You can not say so, commonsense will not allow you to pronounce such a verdict.

The real fact is, that this vast sub-continent of ours is the combination of so many separate political units. It was so in the pre-historic days and in the epic era, in the days of Hindu domination and in that of the Muslims. Even today, when the mighty Britishers are the rulers, India is not an 'undivided whole', no central authority of an all-India character is in existence here. The slogan of *Akhand Hindustan* is, therefore, nothing but a misnomer.

Geography And Climate.

India is a vast country and to define this vastness many have found it convenient to use the word 'sub-continent' as the epithet of this great land of ours. In reality, India cannot at all be called a 'country', it is something like a 'continent' and all the characteristics of a 'real' continent will be found here.

Let us examine the question in the light of geography and climatic conditions. Apart from the great Himalayas, we have got many more mountains intersecting the land from one end to another. The Bindhachal is the natural boundary line between the North and the South and, in fact, it has divided the country into two separate regions. This natural division was recognised long long ago and, that is

why, Aryans of the olden days very aptly named these two regions as *Aryavarta* and *Dakshinatya*. There are also the Western Ghat and Eastern Ghat mountains, the Nilgiries, Rajmahal Hills, Raghunandan Parbat and many other Himalayan ranges, in addition to innumerable smaller hills scattered all over the country. All these natural barriers are dividing the country into so many geographical units.

And there are great rivers, like the Ganges, Jamuna, Indus, Brahmaputra, Meghna, Godavary, Kavery and Krishna, with their hundreds of tributaries all over the country. Naturally, these rivers are also acting as boundary lines between various geographical regions.

Climatic condition of a country is determined, more or less, according to its geographical position. In India we find that climate of mountainous regions are quite different from that of the plains. Again, the climate of the Punjab and some other places of Upper India is quite opposed to the climatic conditions prevailing in the riparian plains of Bengal and the South.

In short, India is a land of so many geographical regions with different climatic conditions prevailing in different places and, in no way, this vast land of ours can be considered to be a uniform whole and,

therefore, the claim of 'geographical unity' falls to the ground.

Racial Differences.

Racially India is the land of heterogeneous peoples. Almost all the races of the world will be found here. It has already been stated that Dravadians were the original inhabitants of this land and later on, from the plains of Central Asia, Aryans came to settle here. After that, as has been stated in the epic stories, for a long time these two races—Aryans and Dravadians—fought each other with the result that ultimately Aryans got the upper hand and Dravadians were either driven to the jungles or given the name of *Sudra* and taken into the Aryan society as slaves and serfs. From the injunctions of Hindu Scriptures, specially of the *Manu-Samhita*, this can be gathered that these original children of the soil were subjected to inhuman cruelty and barbarity. However, for a long time India was the homeland of only these two contending races. In Kashmir, the Punjab and other north-western provinces people of pure Aryan blood will mostly be found, while original Dravadian people are residents of jungle areas throughout the country. *Nagas*, *Garoos*, and *Kukies* of Assam, *Bhils*, *Koles* and *Santhals* of Central Indian hills and the black

people of the South are, no doubt, of Dravadian stock.

From Tibet and China Mongolian people came to this country after the advent of Buddhism. People belonging to this yellow race are, mainly, found in eastern frontier provinces. Nepal, Bhutan, Assam and some eastern-most districts of Bengal are conspicuous with their presence.

People belonging to the Semitic races will also be found in many places, specially in Malabar, Sindh and Chittagong area of Bengal. They first came to India as traders from Arabia. Later on, with the Muslim invading forces and with saints like Khwaja Mainuddin Chishti, Kutubuddin Bakhtiar Kaki, Shah Salim Chishti, Shah Jalal Yemeni and others, many more people of Semitic origin came to India and settled here for good.

Apart from these four original groups, there are cross-bred elements, who are numerically the most important factor in this land. These mixed people will be found in every part of the country.

Now, we find that India is the land of four different racial elements, who can claim original blood in their veins. Each of these original races has its distinctive characteristics and it is clear that they are not 'one'. As regards the mixed people, though

they have lost their originality and cannot, perhaps, claim any distinctiveness like Aryans or Semitics or Mongolians, yet it cannot be denied that they themselves constitute a separate group—the fifth one—and do not belong to any of the original four groups mentioned above.

Where the position is such, how can you claim that India is racially one ? Facts do not, at all, support such a claim.

Cultural Diversity.

There may be an Aryan culture, a Dravadian culture, a Mongolian culture, a Semitic culture and even a Hindu or an Islamic culture. But can you conceive of anything like an Indian culture ? You cannot, because such a thing does not exist and to expect such a thing will be expecting an absurdity.

In fact, India is a land of different and varied cultures. The culture and civilisation of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa is, perhaps, the oldest one for which India can feel proud. But Dravadian culture was also one of the oldest. At a time this culture and civilisation of the original children of the soil flourished so much that even Aryans had to borrow many a custom and usages from this 'despised'

people. Worship of *Kali,* the goddess of power and that of *Sitala*, the goddess of small-pox, worship of *Manasa*, the snake-goddess and that of monkey-god *Hanumanjee* have now become part and parcel of Hindu religion ; but it cannot be denied that these were originally religious festivals of the primitive Dravadian people. The cult of Kapaliks, who used to indulge in human-sacrifice, is also an instance of primitive Dravadian influence on the Hindus. From these examples we can presume that though they were politically vanquished, the Dravadian people had their cultural influence over their enemies, the Aryans, for a long time. Even upto the present these primitive people have been able to preserve their distinctive culture and customs in those parts of the country, where they now live.

Aryans came to this country with a highly developed culture and civilisation of their own. The *Vedas*, *Puranas*, *Smrities*, *Upanishadas* and the great Epics illustrate full well as to the height and perfection which this culture once reached. The distinctive culture of the present-day Hindu society is, no doubt, a synonym for the old Aryan culture and as the inheritor of such a glorious legacy our Hindu friends may justly feel pround.

Mongolians, who came to this country from China and Tibet, had also their own culture and civilisation ; but certainly not so developed as the Aryan culture was. Besides, a section of the Mongolian settlers adopted Hindu religion from the very beginning and the rest, who were originally converted to the religion of Buddha, had to give up that religion in favour of Hinduism when the Buddhists of India were faced with all sorts of oppression only because of their faith. Thus, with the adoption of the Hindu faith these people, to some extent, became converts to the Aryan culture and civilisation also. Inspite of this, however, in Nepal and Bhutan, in Manipur and Khasi Hills, in Tripura State and Chittagong Hill-Tracts and in Cox-Bazar area, there are many people of Mongolian stock, who have, up to the present, preserved their own old culture, customs and usages.

Now, about the Semitic culture. Owing to the influence of Islam on it, this culture from Arabia is also known as Islamic culture. Through the Arab traders and Muslim saints it was first introduced into India. Later on, during the seven long centuries of Muslim rule, with the help and patronage of the rulers themselves, it developed such a perfection that

even orthodox Hindus were greatly influenced by it. This goes without saying that reforms introduced in the Hindu society by eminent persons like Raja Ram Mohan Ray, Swami Dayanand Saraswati and Keshab Chandra Sen, were greatly due to the influence of this Islamic culture. This powerful culture is the basis of distinctive Muslim architecture in India, a great example of which is the Taj at Agra. The school of the Mughal Art of Painting and the Urdu language are also gifts of this culture. Today, we find that in the daily life of Muslims all over the country, the influence of this Islamic culture is so prominently evident that all their thoughts and actions are governed by this.

In addition to the main cultural influences mentioned above, India has also got many other cultures and civilisations of lesser importance. As for instance, the cultural life of the Parsee community and that of the Sikhs may be mentioned. Though a branch of the old Pahlav Aryans, the Parsee community has developed a fully distinctive culture of its own and in no way it is under Hindu influence. The cultural life of the Sikhs also, to some extent, differs from that of the Hindus. They have even got their own language and script.

Further discussion on the subject is not, perhaps, necessary. Instances already cited will prove beyond doubt that culturally also India is not a 'single whole,' but a country of divergent cultures. Each of these cultures having its particular distinctiveness, no affinity in this respect can, at all, be found.

Language And Script.

If we study the linguistic problems of India, then also the truth comes out that the idea of *Akhand Hindustan* is not based on facts. As India is the land of heterogeneous peoples, they also speak very many languages. The principal languages are Urdu, Hindi, Bengali, Gujrati, Marhatti, Tamil, Telegu, Malayalam, Uriya, Assamese and Pushtu. All these languages have their particular scripts. Besides, there are numerous minor languages and dialects, such as, Nepali, Bhutia, Kashmiri, Gurmukhi, Beluchi, Khasi, Lapcha, Garoo, Santhali, Arakanese, Sindhi, Chittagongian etc. In majority of the cases, these minor languages and dialects are only spoken and no scripts for writing them have yet been developed. But recently, thanks to the efforts of missionaries, researches are being made to develop scripts for some of these dialects.

Of the principal languages, Urdu and Hindi may be termed as two sister languages, while Bengali, Assamese and Uriya belong to the same group. Similarly all the South Indian languages—Tamil, Telegu and Malayalam—belong to one group, while Gujrati and Marhatti are, again, two sister languages. Pushtu is a quite different language, spoken only by the people of the north-western frontier regions.

Though Hindi and Urdu are two sister languages and spoken widely in Upper India, the scripts of these two are quite different from one another. Urdu is written in Arabic script, while the script of Hindi is Deva-Nagri. Urdu is spoken mostly by the Muslims, while Hindi is a Hindu language of Upper India. In search of a *Rashtra-Bhasha*, i.e. a lingua-franca, the Congress people have tried their best to develop a mixed language of Hindi and Urdu and to name it as Hindustani. But this attempt produced very little result, no solution of the problem of script being possible. Hindus were not prepared to adopt the Arabic script of Urdu, while Muslims objected against the Deva-Nagri script. Ultimately Congress pundits declared that *Rashtra-Bhasha* Hindustani may be written in both the scripts. In plain words, this attempt for finding a common language with a common script failed very miserably

and from it the truth came out that 'united India' on the basis of language is nothing but an impractical proposition.

About other sister languages or languages of the same group, no such attempts at unification were ever made. All these languages are so different from one another that, though of the same group, Assamese or Uriya is but Greek to a Bengali peasant, while to a native of Assam or Orissa, Bengali is the same. In the same way, Gujrati is quite unintelligible to a Marhatta and to a native of Gujrat, Marhatti is no better. The same thing can be said of South Indian sister languages.

As one language differs very much from another, we find that even the same language is spoken differently by different sections of the people. To illustrate this, the instance of Bengal can be cited. It is a fact that Bengali is the language of all the Bengalees irrespective of caste and creed. But in practice we find that the Bengali spoken by the Muslim population differs widely from that spoken by the Hindus. Muslims generally use more of Arabic and Persian words in their 'Bengali', while Hindus are not accustomed to such a practice. Even every-day common words are spoken differently by a Hindu

and a Muslim. As for instance, the equivalent for water in Bengali is *Jala*, which is generally used by all the Hindus ; while to a Muslim it is always *Pani*. Bathing is *Snan* in Bengali and used as such by the Hindus, but Muslims always use *Ghusal* for it. Breakfast is *Nashta* to a Muslim, while it is *Khabar* or *Jal-Khabar* to a Hindu. Meat is *Mangsa* in Bengali, which is generally used by every Hindu, but to a Muslim this is always *Gusht*. Curry is *Byanjan* to a Hindu, while this is nothing but *Salan* in a Muslim household. Then, there are Allah, Rasul, Quran, Hadis, Azan, Namaz, Ruza, Wazoo, Kalema, Iman, Hadj, Zakat, Fitra, Sadqa, Imam, Muqtadi, Farz, Sunnat, Nafl, Pak, Napak, Fajr, Zoohr, Asar, Maghrib, Isha, Ibadat. Bandegi, Tasbih, Telawat and thousands of such other Arabic words, used every day by the Muslims in connection with their religious observances.

Space does not allow us to deal with the matter at length. But from the above discussion alone, we can come to the conclusion that linguistic differences are so widely evident in India that not only one area differs from the other in this respect, but there are even 'community languages'; i.e. the spoken language of a particular community does not tally with that of another.

Now the question is, in this babel of languages, where a man cannot understand even his neighbour and where one man writes from the left and the other from the right, is it possible to think in terms of 'one nationhood' ?

No, not at all.

Religious Differences.

Now, about the religions of India. It is correct that with the spread of English education, a section of our people has become, more or less, westernized. But still, religion is the main prop of Indian people. As in all the countries of the East, the influence of religion on the daily life of Indian people is also very strong. No Indian, whether he be educated or not, can ignore his religion ; rather religion is above everything to him. With such unmistakable zeal every Indian follows his religion and, that is why, the problem of religious differences has become the most difficult of Indian problems.

As India is the land of so many 'cultures', we have got a great many religions also. Of course, two main religions of the country are Hinduism and Islam. Though it is very difficult to define Hinduism, with its innumerable sects of divergent views and ways of life,

it is an admitted fact that about three hundred millions of Indians follow this religion. Islam is the religion of one hundred million of Indian Muslims. In addition to these two main religions, there are Christianity, with a substantial following and also the religion of Zoroaster, though the number of followers of this religion is not very great. And then, there are Buddhism, Sikhism, Jainism and Animism. The teachings and tenets of Buddhism are quite contrary to those of Hinduism. Such is the case with Sikhism and also with Jainism. Parsees of Bombay Presidency have preserved intact their old religion of Zoroaster, while aboriginal people all over the country are followers of their 'own' religion, which may be termed as Animism.

With regard to the main articles of faith all the above mentioned religions are opposed to each other, no 'affinity' between any two of them can be found. To illustrate this contention it may be said that while Islam preaches the message of one God only, Who has no partner and "Who begets not, nor is begotten"; according to Hinduism there are innumerable gods and of them *Brahma* the creator, *Bishnu* the maintainer and *Maheswara* or *Siva* the destroyer hold the supreme positions. Christian belief in God the father, God the son and the Holy Ghost is a well-known fact.

Buddhists do not believe in any God at all, their main article of faith being *Nirvan* through *Ahimsa.* And according to the Zoroastrian belief there are two gods—*Ahuja Mazda,* the god of good deeds and *Ahreman,* the god of evil deeds. Although the Sikhs and Jains of today have, to some extent, merged themselves in the Hindu cult, yet in belief they are also monotheists and opposed to idolatry.

Not only with regard to beliefs only, but in practice also, the religions of India differ widely from one another. In most of the cases it is found that while certain deeds are 'lawful' in one religion, the same are 'forbidden' in another. To illustrate this, we can mention some instances from the two principal religions, Hinduism and Islam. According to Hindu religious practices idolatry is the main source of worship, while according to Islam idolatry is the greatest of sins. According to original Brahmanic Hinduism, human society is divided into four *varna* or groups, of them Brahmans occupy the superior position, Kshatriyas second, Vaisyas third and the Sudras fourth or the most inferior position. But according to Islam there is no difference between a man and a man, all human beings are equal, they are like brothers. Drinking of wine and taking of intoxicants like *Ganja* and *Bhang*

are considered to be essentials in acts of worship, specially in the *Shaiva* and *Shakta* cults of the Hindu riligious order ; but in Islam wine and all sorts of intoxicants are strictly forbidden things. Playing of music, again, is a part of the act of worship according to Hindu religion, but according to Islam music is but a 'satanic instrument' of obstruction against the prayer of a believer. Cow-dung is a purifying material to the Hindus, but according to Islam this is one of the most impure things. The cow itself is one of the gods to the Hindus, but according to Islam it is nothing but a beast created by God for the service of mankind, the supreme of all the creations. Hundreds of instances of the like nature can be quoted ; but neither this is necessary nor space at our disposal permits such a lengthy dissertation. Only this much can be added that in other religions also, there are practices and deeds, which are diametrically opposed to each other.

Plainly speaking, in India the problem of religious differences is so complicated that there is no hope of achieving any 'real' unity in this sphere. In the past, Emperor Akbar tried his best for such an unity through his artificial 'religion' *Din-i-Ilahi*. But what was the result ? With the death of Akbar, his artificial

religion also died a natural death. If such attempts are made anew, it is sure that the result will be the same. It will, therefore, be the right thing to recognise the 'differences' and to approach the problem with such an understanding.

Will everybody concerned understand this ?

Dress, Diet And Mode Of Living.

The claim of 'oneness' of the Indians vanishes into the thin air when one considers the question of dress, diet and mode of living as well.

It cannot be denied that nowhere in the world so many types and styles of dress will be found as in India. A Frontier man with his turban, loose pyjama and short coat worn over long shirt, a Bengalee Hindu Bhadralog with his dhuti, long kurta and without any headgear at all, a Madrasi Brahman with his dhuti worn like a skirt and with his white pugree, a Mopla with his coloured lungi, kurta and skull-cap of Arabian type, a Marwari with his dhuti, long coat and peculiar type of multi-coloured pugree, a Lucknow man with his sherwani, skull-cap and tight breeches, all these types and styles of dress certainly speak of the truth that India cannot, in any way, be considered to be a single country. Not only

regional differences are evident with regard to the styles and types of dress, but in some places it is also found that even separate communities wear separate types of dress. And then, there are the primitive people with scanty dress or almost no dress.

With regard to the dress of fair sex also, the same thing can be said. While women of the north-western regions and the Punjab generally wear loose pyjamas, long kurtas and chaddars as head-coverings, women of other parts of the country generally wear saries with bodices. In Rajputana and some other parts of the country Hindu women wear skirts called ghagras, with kachulies as breast-binders and chaddars to cover their heads. Even saries are worn in different styles by the women of different parts of the country. In short, no 'uniformity' in the matter of dress can be found anywhere in this country.

The position with regard to diet also is the same. While the main diet of Bengalee people is boiled rice, the people of the north-western parts of the country generally live on bread prepared from wheat flour. The staple food of people residing in the South and Central Indian plains is also boiled rice. The people of Bengal and South India cannot, in any circumstance, live on wheat products only. Such

is the case with Upper Indian people also, to whom rice cannot be a proper substitute for their regular diet. In 1943, at the time of the Bengal Famine, when rice was not sufficiently available in Calcutta for several days, the author faced such a situation, when his wife—a Bengalee lady—favoured even starvation than a diet composed mainly of wheat products.

There are some sects in the Hindu community, who are generally vegetarians and never eat any kind of meat. Buddhists and Jains are also vegetarians. Of meat, beef is never taken by a Hindu, while to a Muslim pork is a strictly 'forbidden food.' Where the dietetic position is such, we cannot but admit that India is not a country where the theory of 'one nationhood' can reasonably fit.

Now, about the mode of living. Generally it varies according to the economic conditions of the populace. Social customs and usages, religious beliefs, educational standards, climatic conditions, dress and diet are also important contributory factors in this respect. It is generally found that the position of the people in this regard is not 'uniform' everywhere, it differs very much from place to place. That is why, even the lay-out of a village and homesteads in it is not of the same nature in every province.

Besides, various sections of the people have also their own ways of living. In short, from this point of view also, India is not 'one', on the contrary divided and partitioned into so many compartments.

* * *

From what we have discussed so far, it has been established that India is not 'one' and was never so, according to any definition whatsoever. Now, the question naturally arises, if from time immemorial Indians could have tolerated so many divisions, why this row against the demand of Pakistan today? In fact, Pakistan is not anything new, we do not want to divide India anew between the Hindus and the Muslims. Our demand is only for the political recognition of those 'divisions', which are already in existence in the shape of 'national homelands' of the Muslims in the north-western and eastern zones of the sub-continent. This is an axiomatic truth that Beluchistan, North-West Frontier Province. the Punjab and Sindh (and also Kashmir) in the north-western zone and Bengal and Assam in the eastern zone of India, are preponderingly Muslim areas and, as such, can be termed as 'national homelands' of the Muslims. You cannot but admit this 'fact' and when you admit this, you are really admitting the existence of Pakistan itself.

II

THE TWO-NATIONS THEORY.

Pakistan is a name—a slogan—which means and defines existing 'national homelands' of the Muslim population in India. "National"? Yes, that is what we mean. We, Muslims, are a separate 'nation' and, moreover, we have got our separate 'homelands' in certain parts of the country, for which we want political sanction. That is the sum and substance of our demand.

This claim of the Muslims about separate nationhood is not based on sentimental grounds only; on the contrary it is based on the rock-bottom foundation of 'facts'. What are these facts? The following quotation from the writings of Mr. Jinnah, will aptly answer this query:

> "Hinduism and Islam represent two distinct and separate civilisations and, moreover, are as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are nations of Europe.... They are, in fact, two different nations."*

But the critic, through the Press and from hundreds of platforms, has raised a hue and cry

* Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah.

against this claim of separate nationhood of the Muslims. The nature of this 'objection' against our claim will, amply, be illustrated by the opinion of no less a person than Mr. Gandhi, when he says :

> "I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock.' *

Is this the exact reading of the Muslim claim ? Certainly not, rather this is an instance of wilful misrepresentation. Muslims do not claim separate nationhood as 'a body of converts and their descendants' only, but their claim is based on more sounder a basis than this. Again, in the words of Mr. Jinnah :

> "We maintain and' hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million and, what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture, name and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, cutoms and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions. In short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation."†

*Mr. Gandhi's letter to Mr. Jinnah, September, 1944.
†Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah.

Culture And Civilisation.

Our first contention is that the Hindus and the Muslims have their separate cultures and civilisations. You cannot but admit this. In the daily life of the people around you, the influence of their separate culture and civilisation is so vividly manifested that to perceive this no artificial spectacles are required, you can see it by your naked eyes. As we have discussed the subject previously, no lengthy argument will, perhaps, be needed. Only this much can be asserted that Islamic culture and the civilisation connected with it have, in fact, nothing common with Hindu culture and Aryan civilisation. Both are quite different from one another and it cannot be denied that by the test of this essential qualification, the Hindus and the Muslims very naturally have become two separate 'peoples'.

Language And Literature.

Secondly, we shall have to consider the question of language and literature. In course of our previous discussion, it has been proved that Urdu is a Muslim Language, while Hindi is nothing but a Hindu language. Apart from this, where the same language is current among both the communities, even there

the language is spoken differently by the Hindus and the Muslims. To illustrate this we have cited some instances from the Bengali language, which, no doubt, will prove beyond doubt that linguistically also the Hindus and the Muslims are two separate 'nations'. Incidentally this may also be added that Muslims have their separate script for writing Urdu and Hindi is written in a different script.

As we have got our own language, so a literature—an Islamic literature—is also in existence. The Quran and Hadis and Islamic history are the main sources of this distinctive literature of our own, while Hindu literature is, mainly, based on the Vedas, Puranas, Upanishadas and the Epics. Even in books of general literature—in novels, dramas and poems—Hindu ideas and influences predominate where the author is a Hindu and in the same way, Islamic ideas and influences will greatly be found in books written by Muslim authors. To illustrate this, let us quote a sentence from a Bengali childen's primer. The sentence runs : "Yudhisthirer moto dharmik loke birol"—a pious man like Yudhisthir is found rarely. Mark the idea underlying the sentence. The author, who is a Hindu, could not conceive of any pious man other than Yudhisthir, the eldest of the Pandavas.

Such an example will never occur to a Muslim and the Muslim author will, invariably, name Omar the Great instead of Yudhisthir, if he is ever to write such a sentence. Then, there are innumerable idolatrous words like Bhagwan, Bhagwati, Iswar, Narayan, Puja, Archana etc. which are never used by Muslim writers, who are accustomed to use more of Arabic and Persian words in their writings. This proves the contention that with regard to literature also, the Hindus and the Muslims have their 'own' ways.

Art And Architecture.

About art, nobody will deny that the school of Mughal Painting and the Arabic system of calligraphy are examples of distinctive Muslim art and these differ very much from Hindu schools of Oriental Art, whether of the Ajanta or Rajput style. About architecture also, the style of Mughal architecture, a great example of which is the Taj, is distinctively different from the style of Hindu architecture, as depicted by the various temples dedicated to various gods of various sections of the Hindus.

Names And Nomenclatures.

Then, about names and nomenclatures. It is a matter of common knowledge that personal names

of the Muslims are derived from Arabic sources, while Hindu names are generally derived from the Sanskrit. Look at the names Mohan Das and Mohammad Ali, two great names of modern India. Even a child will say that from two different sources have these names been derived and there is no affinity between them. Such is the case with our nomenclatures also. Acharyya is not the same thing as Sayed, and Shaikh or Quazi or Mian or Khan cannot be considered to be of the same nature as Dutt, Chetty, Shukla or Singh. In plain words, the Hindus and the Muslims have got their particular types of names and nomenclatures and decidedly they are two distinct 'peoples'.

Sense Of Value And Proportion.

That the Muslims have got a separate sense of value and proportion and they are quite different from the Hindus in this respect, can be determined from their daily practices in life. Mark any Mussalman and study his behaviour ; you will find that he will not overdo anything neither will he neglect his rightful duties. To him 'transgression' is a sin and 'negligence' also the same. A Muslim will think hundred times before dealing with a controversial

matter and shall remain very much watchful, so that no injustice may creep in. To him 'live and let live' is the principle and, that is why, while demanding Pakistan he is also for Hindustan.

On the contrary, the Hindu sense of value and proportion is such that he is not ashamed in enjoying some privilege even at the sacrifice of others. The best example of such a mentality was evidenced in the municipal affairs of Calcutta, where continually for more than a decade the Mayoral chair was occupied by Hindus one after another and no Hindu ever thought that there are also other communities in Calcutta. The same mentality is active when there is agitation against the demand of Pakistan.

We do not want to say that injustice is inherent in every Hindu; but the fact is that the sense of value and proportion of the majority of Hindus is such that they cannot even conceive how, if they enjoy some privilege, injustice could be done to others. Herein lies the difference between a Hindu and a Muslim. And from this difference the truth comes out that they—the Hindus and the Muslims—have two separate ideologies.

Legal Laws And Moral Codes.

Though India is governed by the British people, yet Indian Muslims have their separate laws. In matters like marriage, divorce, inheritance and trust, Muslims are governed by their own laws and neither British nor Hindu law is applicable to them. Like the Muslims the Hindu community has also its own laws in some particular matters and without any fear of contradiction it can be said that the Hindus and the Muslims are under two separate 'jurisdictions' in this respect.

As regards moral codes also, we find that while the Muslim code is based on religious injunctions of Islam, that of the Hindu community is based on the Hindu Scriptures and long-established usages. Often if is found that an action which is 'lawful' according to the moral code of one commnnity, is considered to be 'unlawful' by the other.

Customs And Calendar.

Customs prevelent in a community generally vary according to local influences. But for the Muslims, their social customs are almost the same everywhere and these are not identical, in any way, with the Hindu customs and usages. Of course, there

are local customs of minor importance here and there which may differ regionally; but these also are not much influenced by local Hindu customs and usages. In fact, the Hindus have their own distinctive ways of life, which do not at all tally with those of the Muslims.

Muslims have also their own calendar, which is based on the lunar system, while Hindu calendar is based on the solar system. Here also, we find that the Hindus and the Muslims have their own 'ways', which can never meet.

History And Tradition.

Now, about history and tradition. It cannot be denied that Islamic history is a great contribution to world civilisation. The Muslim community all over the world is proud of its historic past. The glory which was once Islam has really no parallel. The rapid rise of the Muslim power, their great empire extended from the shores of the Atlantic to those of the Pacific and, along with that, their cultural conquest of the greater portion of the old world, including Europe, can be classed as wonder-achievements. Leaving aside the question of the whole Islamic world, if we only look at the glory of Indian Muslims, then

also our eyes become dazzled. Go to Delhi, Agra, Fatehpur-Sikri, Lahore or any other 'graveyard of Islamic glory in India'. Your heart will throb with emotions. You will feel transformed. You will laugh and then you will weep ! *

Such was our past—the historic past of the Muslim nation—and naturally, every Muslim, no matter wherever he lives, draws his inspiration from this glorious history and tradition of his own. His heroes are, the Prophet himself, Omar the Great, Khalid bin Walid, Tarik and Sultan Salahuddin. In India we look upon Ghazi Mohammad bin Kasem, Maizuddin Mohammad of Ghore, Ikhtiaruddin Mohammad bin Bakhtiar, Babar the Great, the Saint-Emperor Alamghir Aurangzeb and Tipoo Sultan as our national heroes.

The Hindu history and tradition are quite separate from those of the Muslims. Every Hindu is proud of his past history and tradition and he derives his inspiration from this past. His national heroes are Ram Chandra, Lakshman, Krishna, Yudhisthir, Bhimsen and Arjun of the Epics and Chandra Gupta, Asoke, Rana Protap Singh and Sivajee of the historical era.

In short, the Muslims and the Hindus have their 'own' histroy, tradition and national heroes. Their

sources of inspiration are also quite different and, in some cases, even opposed to each other.

Considering all these, can you say that the Hindus and the Muslims belong to the same people ? Certainly you cannot. Undoubtedly they belong to two separate and distinct 'nations.'

Aptitudes And Abmitions.

As is natural, different peoples have their particular likes and dislikes, aptitudes and ambitions, so the case with the Hindus and the Muslims of India also. They differ very much from each other in this respect. Owing to systematic suppression during the first years of British rule in India and again in the post-Mutiny days, the Muslim community could not raise its head for long and it was not possible for them to show their real merit and prove their mettle. But inspite of all these trials and tribulations, they remained undaunted and thus have shown that they posses immense life-force. This life-force of the Muslim people is something unequalled in any other community and, that is why, though small in number in comparison with their opponents—the Hindus—they are not the least afraid of the fight to come. They know and they believe that the life-force which is in them and

which has sustained them throughout many cruel sufferrings, will ultimately lead them to victory. This life-force is the main pivot round which their entire being is revolving and, on account of this only, they are capable of performing wonders.

Performing wonders ? Yes, this is correct, we are not indulging in extravagant phraseology. Look at the Taj, Jumaa Masjid, Dewan-i-Aam, Diwan-i-Khas, Kutub Minar and all the magnificent buildings and monuments throughout the country. Are not these wonder-creations of the Muslims ? Of course, these belong to the past, and really the past is a glorious chapter for the Muslims of India. In the opinion of Sir William Hunter, politically and intellectually the Muslims were the real power of the country at that time. In this respect he says :

> "Before the country passed to us they (the Mussalmans) were not only the political but the intellectual power of India."*

And again :

> "The truth is, when the country passed under our rule, the Mussalmans were the superior race, and superior not only in stoutness of heart and strength of arm, but in power of political organisation and in the science of political government"†.

---

* The Indian Musalmans.

† Ibid.

But all these concern only the past and naturally do not give any evidence as to the present calibre of our nation. We have said previously that due to systematic suppression, both political and economic, and consequent mental lassitude, the Muslim community did not get a chance to prove its real mettle during the black era of foreign rule in this country. The simple fact that inspite of all these sufferings the Muslims of India are still alive as a separate entity and as a nation, will establish the point that really this community is capable of performing wonders.

Then again, look at the Congress movement and that of the Muslim League. The Congress has attained its present position as a result of sixty years of continued effort by great leaders like Gokhale, Tilak, Matilal, Chittaranjan and Gandhi. But the League has attained its present position only through nine years of effort by a single man—Mr. Jinnah. Compare both the figures. What the Congress has done in sixty years, the League has performed almost the same only in nine years. Does not this, again, prove that the Muslim community is really capable of performing wonders ?

The real fact is, if chance is given, the Muslims can perform even the most difficult of things and they

have aptitude for such achievements. More over, slave mentality, meanness, flatery and injustice are quite foreign to them. They are always outspoken. Duplicity does not suit their temperament. What they believe to be right, they will adhere to, even at the risk of their-lives. This trait of character has, today, made the Muslim people a fearless band of warriors fighting for the cause of Pakistan, their national goal.

Speaking of our 'national goal' naturally leads us to the question of ambitions also. What are our ambitions? Put this question to any Mussalman and see what he replies. Invariably he will reply that to be a 'true Mussalman' is his only ambition. To be a 'true Muslim' ? What does this expression mean ? What is the definition of a 'true Mussalman'? The first and foremost principle to a Muslim is the belief in one God. When he declares 'Allaho Akbar'—God is great—he asserts at the same time that he does not recognise any other lord—spiritual or temporal—and his status is above every one who does not believe in one God. For a 'true Muslim', therefore, free Islam in free India or, in other words, Pakistan is the only goal that can be conceived. His ideal is the life led by the Prophet himself and his great apostles like Abu Bakr and Omar.

Hindu aptitudes and ambitions are quite different from those of the Muslims. Of course, they are also capable of performing many great things. Being favoured by the foreign rulers, they got every possible chance of self-improvement and have shown their merit in many walks of life, specially in the field of letters and science, commerce and industry. Inspite of all these achievements, we find that they are lacking in one most important thing, that is, moral courage. As an instance of this we may mention that though a community of three hundred millions of souls, they are still tormented by the pan-Islam bogey.

Temperamentally the Hindus are not straightforward and, therefore, duplicity is their main weapon in politics. Their ambition is also to be free, but the ideal of that freedom is Sivajee's freedom or, in other words, establishment of Hindudom in India under which all the other communities, including the Muslims, will be in bondage of everlasting serfdom like the *Sudras*.

It is, therefore, plain that with regard to aptitudes and ambitions also, the Muslims and the Hindus differ so much that no 'unity' in this respect can even be conceived of.

Religion And Spiritual Life.

Last, but not the least, is the religious and spirtiual life of both the communities. In course of our discussions in the previous chapter it has been stated that religion is the main prop of the Indian peoples and there is a gulf of difference between the communities in this respect.

Leaving aside the question of other religious orders of lesser importance, if we only compare Islam and Hinduism – the two major religions of India—we find that fundamentally both are opposed to each other. Islam is the religion of one God, one Prophet, one Book and one Brotherhood. Monotheism is in the blood of every Mussalman, he cannot but consider a worshiper of other gods to be a 'Kafir' or 'one who is in darkness'. To him the Prophet is not an 'incarnation of God', but only a messenger from Him—a mortal like all other men and, as such, an ideal to be followed, yet after all human. Quran, the Book of God, contains all the moral codes which a Muslim must follow and to him there is no difference between man and man—all the Muslims, rich and poor alike, belong to the same brotherhood.

On these fundamentals rest the spiritual life of a Muslim. To him this material world around us is

only instrumental for the attainment of the spiritual kingdom beyond and, as such, all the worldly materials should be used as means only, instead of being worshipped. A Muslim does not believe in a past life and has no 'black book' behind him. With death the life of a Muslim does not terminate, it is rather like passing of an examination and then promotion to a higher status. Every Mussalman is brought up on these ideas and ideals and, naturally, to him all worldly possesions, even life, are but means to a greater end and not the end itself. Ends are means and not means are ends.

The Hindu religion, with its sectarian beliefs and teachings, with its innumerable gods and goddesses, with the *vedantic* philosophy of 'Maya' and the belief in the transmigration of souls, advocates a spiritual life, quite contradictory to Islamic conception.

* * *

Further discussion on the subject is superfluous. But we must add that not only on the score of religion and spiritual life, but in all other respects also, the Hindus and the Muslims differ so much so that you cannot but recognise them as two different and distinct 'nations'.

Some foreigners, who have practically no intimate knowledge of India and Indian peoples, or whose knowledge is limited to the reading of Jawaherlal's Autobiography or a few more of some such books, or who have become 'authorities on Indian affairs' as a result of a two weeks' whirlwind tour of the sub-continent, have expressed the opinion that 'only for religious differences' Muslims cannot be considered to be a separate nation. But this is not the correct reading of the Muslim point of view ; ours is not a case of 'only religious differences'. On the contrary, ours is a case, where "*Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation*".

In the course of the foregoing pages, we have discussed the subject at length and from all points of view. The contention that the Hindus and the Muslims are two different and distinct nations, has been tested and proved by all possible definitions and there is no doubt that the 'theory of two-nations' has, thus, been established.

III

THE HINDU-MUSLIM PROBLEM.

The Hindus and the Muslims are residing in this sub-continent of India as neighbours for more than one thousand years. But the 'Hindu-Muslim Problem' is comparatively of recent origin. History tells us that during the seven long centuries of Muslim rule, there was no such problem in existence. As Britishers and Indians are, now, considered to be two different peoples, so was the case with the Muslims and the Hindus in those days. There was no such a thing as 'Indian nation', there were only the rulers and the ruled. Muslims were then rulers and, as such, quite a distinct entity from the subject people—the Hindus.

With the advent of the Britishers, Muslims, who were then rulers, lost their throne and with that the special status which was theirs. For their own benefit the foreign rulers invented the myth of 'united India' and with the artificial bond of 'one nationhood' yoked together the Muslims and the Hindus, thus giving birth to the complications, now known as the Hindu-Muslim problem. In plain words, so long as the Hindus and the Muslims were considered to be two

separate peoples, there was no Hindu-Muslim problem. But with the introduction of the wrong notion of 'one nationhood', the problem—this illegitimate child of the British imperialism—was born.

After giving birth to this child of discord, the Britishers nurtured it with much care and zeal from its infancy. They preached the gospel of 'one nationhood', brought both the Hindus and the Muslims under common subjection and, at the same time, introduced the policy of 'divide and rule'. The historical evidences in favour of this cotention are so numerous that to substantiate this, no lengthy argument is required. Let us see what really occurred.

The Artificial 'United India'.

With the fall of Nawab Sirajuddowlah, the British people practically became rulers of Bengal, Behar and Orissa, though on the throne of Delhi a weakling of the 'Great Mughals' was still seated. After that, within a very short time Madras, Bombay, United Provinces and other parts of the country were also annexed and for the proper and profitable governance of the conquered territories, a 'central government' with the Govenor-General at its head was evolved. This is, how, the principle of 'united India' and a

'central government' was first introduced. Later on, after the Mutiny, when the last of the Mughal Emperors was made a prisoner and banished to Burmah to die a miserable death there, the Britishers virtually became masters of almost the whole of India, excepting of course certain portions of the country which were still free from the British yoke. The 'Princely India' was also created at that time.

Thus, with the fall of the Delhi throne and acquisition of more territories, the Central Government of British India gradually developed into a power and the artificial 'united India' became more expanded. It must be noted that at first only Bengal, Behar and Orissa comprised the area of the socalled 'united India'. But later on, Madras, Bombay, U. P. and other parts of the country were also added and in this way the present shape of 'united British India' has been gradually formed. It is needless to point out that no portion of the socalled 'united India' joined the union of its own accord; on the contrary with the help of the British arms all these parts were acquired and annexed to the union according to the will of the conquerors.

So, not the people of India, but the British bayonet is the real creator of the so called 'union' of the whole

of India and the Central Government for it. What was the motive of the early Britishers in creating such an artificial union ? Primarily, perhaps for the lack of a suitable administrative machinery, the authorities of the East India Company could not conceive of any other arragement than this. But British statesmen of the later period retained this system undoubtedly for other reasons. What might be those reasons ? According to the opinion of Mr. Jinnah, the reasons were the following :

> "British statesmen put out the plea of 'united India', because they knew that was the only way by means of which they could prolong and continue their overlordship over the entire sub-continent of India. They encouraged the theory of 'united India' knowing full well that the two would never agree. They are putting the two together so that they can play the role of arbitrator and mete out the kind of justice which the monkey dispensed to the two cats."*

The story of the monkey and the cats ! The selfish monkey of the fable, no doubt, played the part of an arbitrator, but in one respect he was better than our present arbitrators. The monkey had, in fact, no part it putting the foolish cats together, they came

*Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah.

together of their own accord. But our present masters created an artificial union of the whole of India and thus have put the Hindus and the Muslims together, so that they may indulge in everlasting quarrels over the loaves and fishes, thus providing an excuse for arbitration to the third party—the masters themselves. This masterly plan has fully succeeded and, that is why, we find the Hindu-Muslim problem ever present and beyond any solution.

If there were no such artificial union and the unreal theory of 'one nationhood' and if the Hindus and the Muslims—two distinct nations—were not thrown together through these machinations, certainly there would have been no Hindu-Muslim problem at all.

'Divide And Rule' Policy.

But unfortunately the 'union', though artificial, is there and both from the Congress and Governmental platforms the theory of 'one nationhood' is being consistently preached and, with that, the working of the policy of 'divide and rule' and consequent persecution of the Muslims. This trio—the unholy combination of the three—is making the Hindu-Muslim problem more bitter and confused.

Britishers conquered this country from the Muslims

and, as such, it was quite natural that each of the contending parties—the Muslims and the British—shall have a sense of ill-feeling towards the other. This natural ill-feeling of the British power towards the Muslims took the practical shape of a policy of systematic suppression and persecution in various ways. And to perpetrate this infamous war against the Muslims, British statesmen of the earlier days, very cunningly, took the Hindus into their confidence. What was the effect of this alliance ? Let us quote from Achyut Patwardhan and Asoke Mehta :

> "It was with the help of Hindus that the English overwhelmed the Muhammadans' power."*

Mr. S. C. Hill, in course of his introduction to 'Bengal in 1756-57,' observed :

> "We find that the partisans of the British were almost all Hindus or proteges of the Hindus."†

Why the Hindus became partisans of the new rulers ? What benefit did they derive from such an unholy alliance? They were provided with jobs, services and, above all, were raised to the position of landlords at the cost of the Muslims. The following quotation on the subject of the Permanent Settlement

* The Communal Triangle in India.

† Ibid

Act of Bengal, will give atleast some idea about the real position :

> "It (the Act) elevated the Hindu collectors, who upto that time had held but unimportant posts, to the position of landholders, gave them a proprietary right in the soil, and allowed them to accumulate wealth which would have gone to the Mussalmans under their own rule. *

This policy of bestowing favours upon the Hindus and with their help persecuting the Muslims, was followed all over the country in the early days of the British rule. "The commercial and Hindu bourgeois of Bengal were used", says Mr. Z. A. Suleri, "to crush the feudal Muslim aristocracy there........ The Jain and Hindu merchants in other parts of India vied with each other in helping the British to establish their rule in this country." †

Thus, with the help of the Hindus and other non-Muslim elements, this war of persecution against the Muslims continued, and continued for a long time.

As a result of this systematic persecution, the Muslim community, specially the Muslim aristocracy, were virtually relegated to the position of 'hewers of

* Mr. James O' Kinley, quoted in The Communal Triangle in India

† My Leader.

wood and drawers of water'. All possible measures were adopted to deprive them of their previous position and prestige and ultimately to level them down. In the words of the great Sir Sayed Ahmad :

> "There was no calamity in those days which was not attributed to the Muslims and there is no doubt that any calamity which fell from the firmament might not have come straight to some Muhammadan house bringing ruin and destruction."*

In 1870, Sir William Hunter in his famous book wrote about the condition of the then Bengalee Muslims in the following language :

> "A hundred and seventy years ago, it was impossible for a well-born Musalman in Bengal to be poor ; at present it is almost impossible for him to continue rich." †

Why such a sad lot befell the Muslims and how ? Because their properties were confiscated, they were removed from the Army, driven from the field of education by the abolition of Persian and introduction of English in its place and also for the reason that the door of services was closed to them. Hunter says in this respect :

"In fact, there is now scarcely a Government

* My Leader.
† The Indian Musalmans.

office in Calcutta in which a Muhammadan can hope for any post above the rank of porter, messenger, filler of ink-pots and mender of pens." *

This is, how the Muslims were persecuted, while the Hindus were unduly favoured. The policy of such 'divide and rule' was, thus, introduced in the early days of the British rule, specially after the Mutiny and Wahhabi movement.

This policy continued for a long time and is still being continued, though comparatively with less vigour. Burra Sahib-cum-Burra Babu Raj was in existence till recently in almost all the Government offices, with the result that Muslims were not getting their due share in the public services. Ultimately to protect the rights of the Muslims communal ratio had to be fixed. But there is no dearth of pretexts and these are being freely applied against the Muslims in many offices even now.

Such is the case with regard to Muslim representation in the self-governing institutions also. Previously except through the back door of nominations, it was simply impossible for a Muslim to enter such an institution. Later on, the position improved to some extent ; but even then Muslims were being

* The Indian Musalmans.

denied their rightful share of 'self-government' in its every sphere. As an example of such 'injustice' we may mention of the Muslim position in the Bengal Legislatures. During the era of Mont-Ford Reforms the Muslims had only 40 seats in the Legislative Council out of a total of 140, though numerically they were a community of more than 52 per cent of the total population at that time. And now, when the Muslim population of the Province has become 55 per cent of the total, the present Constitution has alloted to them only 119 seats out of a total of 250 in the Legislative Assembly, while according to the population basis they were entitled to atleast 137 seats. But this democratic right was denied to them and, thus, the majority has been reduced to a minority, dependent on the will of others.

The same condition prevails everywhere and it is a general complaint that while the Muslims are being victimised, the Hindus are reaping the benefit of such victimisation.

The Hindu Mentality.

As a result of the 'divide and rule' policy, the Muslim community has, very naturally, become suspicious and distrustful of the Hindus. They have seen that

their neighbours openly sided with the new rulers and were amply rewarded for such a colaboration. Even today, it is found that while Muslim rights and interests are being ignored, the Hindus are, generally, favoured unduly and in most of the cases at the cost of the Muslims. Where the position is such, nobody can blame the Muslims for their distrust towards the Hindus. On the contrary, it must be admitted that Muslims have reasonable grounds for such suspicion and distrust.

The Hindu mentality as displayed in their every day behavior, has moreover intensified the natural distrust which was, as stated above, already present in the minds of the Muslims against the Hindus. One can understand the mentality of the victor when he persecutes the vanquished, but when a co-sufferer sides with the victor in his campaign of such persecutions, the mentality of the co-sufferer really becomes objectionable.

Unfortunately our Hindu neighbours have displayed such an objectionable mentality all through. By their actions they have proved that when in power, they readily misuse that power and do not even hesitate in shamelessly persecuting the Muslims under them. During the twenty-seven months of Congress

Ministries in U. P., Behar, C. P. and other Hindu majority provinces, numerous instances of such persecutions were witnessed. Concrete examples of many cases of this nature were published in the famous Pirpur Report and, therefore, no detailed discussion on this point is necessary.

Till recently it was a matter of common knowledge that in those offices, where Hindu Burra Babus or Sheristadars were holding key positions, it was simply impossible for a Muslim to find any employment there. After the introduction of the communal ratio rules, the position has improved to some extent ; but still it is found that these Burra Babus are not wanting in pretexts to deprive the Muslim applicants of their rightful share of appointments.

The position is still worse in those places, where the authorities are themselves Hindus. The offices of the Calcutta University, where almost no Muslim will be found, are the best examples of such cases. And then, there are hundreds and thousands of big business firms, conducted solely by the Hindus. If you go to any of these firms, you will certainly be surprised to find that complete 'Hindu-Raj' is in existence there and not a single Mussalman, excepting perhaps a few peons and porters, is holding any important position. As an

example of such a state of affairs, we may mention the case of a big Banking and Insurance firm of Calcutta, the Managing Director of which is a 'nationalist' Hindu. Some time ago we came across an Annual Report of this firm, in which a list of various Branches of the firm was printed with names of employees working in each Branch. Out of curiosity we went through the list of names and noted with surprise that in a roll of 327 names, only 3 were Muslims. The position is almost the same in all the Hindu business firms, and everywhere—in Calcutta, in Bombay, in Madras and in all the other upcountry centres. On the contrary, the position in a Muslim business firm is quite different; so many Hindu employees will always be found there working side by side with their Muslim coleagues.

And then, there is the social and economic boycott of the Muslims by the Hindus. Everybody knows that a Hindu will not inter-marry or inter-dine with a Muslim, he will not allow a Muslim to enter his kitchen or dining room and he will not take any food (even drinks) offered by a Muslim. Those who have themselves seen those big signboards of Hindu Water and Muslim Water in upcountry Railway Stations, will easily understand the Hindu mind in this respect.

Of course, these are done in the name of 'religion', but it cannot be denied that through this socalled 'religious' boycott a deep-rooted contempt for everything Muslim has been created in the mind of every Hindu. It is, perhaps, for this reason that in big towns and cities like Calcutta, Bômbay and Madras, Hindu house-owners, as a rule, do not let out their houses to the Muslim tenants. From personal experience we can say that if a Muslim is in need of a house to live in, he will have to search from one end of the town to the other and nowhere a Hindu-owned house will be rented to him, though that house may remain vacant and un-tenanted for months together. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Hindu house-owners have, however, no disliking for a Christian, a Jew, a Chinese or even a Negro tenant.

Not only this, it is also found that a Hindu does not at all care to know and, hence, knows very little about the customs and beliefs of his Muslim neighbours. The saddest thing in this respect is that even highly educated and socalled 'nationalist' Hindus often display an unpardonable ignorence about Muslim affairs and some of them even do not care to pronounce or write a Muslim name correctly. As instances of such ignorence we have seen Sir Abdur Rahim made

into Sir Abdar and Suhrawardy pronounced as Surabardi. In the same way, Mukhlesur Rahman has been turned into a peculiar creature as Mukuleswar Rahman and even the name of 'Rashtrapati' Abul Kalam Azad has been given the shape of Abdul Kalam Azad. Some Hindus will not hesitate in addressing a Muslim as 'shreejut' so-and-so and it is a pity that even a person like Mr. Gandhi could have addressed Mr. Jinnah as 'Shree' Jinnah. It is always found that 'Namaz' is pronounced as 'Nemaj' by the average Hindu and many of them do not even know how many times a Muslim performs his prayers daily or how many days he keeps his fast during the month of *Ramzan*.

Some years ago the author came across a Bengali book in which something was written about Hazrat Ali, the great apostle of the Prophet. The author of the book, who was a Hindu, in course of a foot-note explained that Hazrat Ali was the 'founder of Muslim religion.' While the average Hindu displays such a horrible ignorence about the religion, customs and usages of Muslims, it is found that almost every Muslim knows a good deal about Hindu religion and culture, and they do not find any difficulty in writing or pronouncing the most difficult of Hindu names.

More over, they are not so foolish as to address a Hindu as 'Moulvi' Rajendra Prosad or 'Moulana' Mohan Das.

In the economic field, 'Buy Hindu' is the main principle with every Hindu and, as such, he is not ready to purchase any comodity from a Muslim, if it is possible to find the same in a Hindu shop. Previousiy in Calcutta it was a general sight that tailoring shops, book-binding business and the trade in leather goods were almost the monopoly of the Muslims. But now-a-days due to this policy of economic boycott of the Muslims, many hundreds of Hindu tailoring shops have sprung up all over the city and the number of Hindu-owned shoe-stalls and book-binding factories are not also very few. The same mentality is evident in almost every branch of the business and sign-boards like 'Hindu Shawl Repairing House' or 'Hindu Bidi Mart' are also not a rarity in these days.

This is the picture, of course only a rough sketch, of the Hindu mentality, which is actively working to widen the gulf of misunderstanding between the Hindus and the Muslims. Is it, therefore, any wonder that the Hindu-Muslim problem is considered to be beyond solution ?

The Partition Of Bengal And Its Aftermath.

The partition of Bengal and the Hindu agitation against it caused much bitterness between the Hindus and the Muslims and, thus, in the very early days of the present century Hindu-Muslim relations became as bad as possible, specially in the eastern provinces of the country. By the Partition the principle of Pakistan was recognised long ago and the eastern zone of the national homelands of Indian Muslims was, thus, given a practical shape. The great Nawab Sir Salimullah Bahadur of Dacca did much in creating this new province of East Bengal And Assam and it was his dream that a time would come when this new province, with its perponderingly Muslim population, will take the shape of a real *Darul-Islam*.

But this dream of *Darul-Islam* could not materialise. The Hindu community started a very strong agitation against the Partition and unfortunately some misguided. Muslims also joined that anti-partition movement. Intimidated by this movement the British Government at last decided to unsettle the 'settled fact' and annulment of the Partition was announced at the Delhi Durbar in 1911.

This anti-partition movement of the Hindu community, though primarily directed against the British

Government, was in practice a movement against the right of self-determination of the Muslims. This movement has, again, proved that interests of the Hindus and those of the Muslims are quite opposed to each other and no question of a 'common cause' between the two can, at all, arise.

Inspite of the fact that some misguided and short-sighted Muslims joined this movement, the great majority of them were against it and, that is why, some Eastern Bengal districts saw so many communal riots at that time. The bitterness which was thus created continued for a long time and the shock which the Muslim community received at the annulment of the Partition added much more to intensify that bitterness.

Arya Samaj, Suddhi, Sangathan, Tanzeem And Tabligh Movements.

Activities of the Arya Samaj and Suddhi-Sangathan movements have also placed another great obstacle in the way of Hindu-Muslim understanding. Though originally the Arya Samaj was a reformist movement inside Hindu society and its founder Swami Dayanand Saraswati was greatly influenced by the teachings of Islam, yet due to the activities of Pundit Lekh Raj and Swami Sraddhanand this purely reformist

movement, later on, took such a shape that activities of the Samaj were, more or less, directed against Islam and the Muslim community. For a long time in Upper India clashes between the Arya Samajists and the Muslims were a notable feature. But with the passing of time, the Samaj has lost its influence to a great extent and it is no more a movement to reckon with. Inspite of this, however, it must be admitted that the mischief which was done, has left a permanent mark in the shape of the misunderstanding between the Hindus and the Muslims and it will never, perhaps, be remedied.

Suddhi and Sangathan movements also did much to widen the gulf of ill-feeling between the two major communities—the Hindus and the Muslims. Suddhi was a neo-Hindu movement for the conversion of non-Hindus into Hinduism and Sangathan aimed at consolidation of the Hindu society in general. Originally according to the Hindu religion there was no sanction for conversion and, hence, when the Suddhi movement first started, a surprise was created everywhere. Ultimately, when a few conversions were made here and there and, more over, these were widely advertised through the Hindu Press, the Muslim community became suspicious and thought that these two—the Suddhi

and Sangathan—were but new weapons to fight the Muslims. Of course, among the socalled 'new converts' to Hinduism, there were very few Muslims. Yet the suspicion which was created among the Muslims, remained unchanged for a long time and, that is why, to counter these neo-Hindu movements, some Muslims thought it advisable to start the Tanzeem and Tabligh movements.

It may at this stage be mentioned that these Muslim movements were not innovations ; for according to Islam conversion and efforts to advance it are fully supported. However, like Suddhi and Sangathan Tanzeem and Tabligh also have lost their vigour now-a-days. But it cannot be denied that due to all these movements the Hindu-Muslim problem has become more of a 'problem' to reckon with.

'Music Before Mosque' And 'Cow-Sacrifice'.

The agitation on the issue of 'music before mosque' is another important factor which, again, contributed much in aggravating the Hindu-Muslim problem. In fact, many a communal riot of the Twenties originated from this issue and ultimately resulted in the loss of many hundreds of lives of both the communities. The great riot of Calcutta, which

continued for about a month in 1926, started from the playing of music before a mosque by a Hindu procession. Riots at Dacca and many other places throughout the country also started on the same ground and resulted in embittering the feelings of both the communities more and more against each other.

Though according to the once famous Bengal Pact of the late Mr. C. R. Das of revered memory, it was agreed upon that the Hindus will not play music before a mosque, in most of the cases in contravention of the Pact Hindu processionists demanded that they had the right to play music before mosques, while the Muslims claimed that according to long-standing practice the Hindus have no such right. This controversy continued for a long time, specially in Bengal. At one time this issue reached such a height that even a person like the late Nawab Bahadur Sir A. K. Ghuznavi did not hesitate in joining the controversy by the publication of a booklet on the subject.

The Nawab Bahadur very ably discussed the subject in the booklet and proved documentarily that neither according to established practice nor on any other ground, could the Hindus claim the right of playing music before a mosque. Unfortunately all these

argumentations produced very little result and peace, in every case, was brought about by the intervention of the much-hated 'third party'—the Government.

This controversy over the question of music before mosque is not, of course, a major factor in the Hindu-Muslim problem to-day. But it must be admitted that the blood, which was once spilt on the issue, has left a permanent wound in the minds of both the communities and this will, perhaps, never heal.

Blood spilt on the question of cow-sacrifice, is also specially mentionable in this respect. To a Hindu the cow may posses the status of a god or goddess, but to a Muslim it is merely an animal created for the service and use of mankind, the acme of all creation. Moreover, according to religious injunctions a Muslim is enjoined to make sacrifices in the name of God at least once a year and cow is one of the animals sanctioned for such a sacrifice. In India, from time immemorial, cow-sacrifice is common among the Muslims. But the Hindu will not tolerate such religious practices of his Muslim neighbour and, where he is in a majority, he will not hesitate even to spill the blood of a fellow human-being to protect the life of an inferior creature like the cow.

In fact, hundreds of instances may be cited, where on the question of cow-sacrifice riots between the Hindus and the Muslims occurred resulting in the loss of many lives from both the communities. It cannot be denied that such riots, again, have further worsened the Hindu-Muslim relations.

Attempts At Unity.

The principal factors which are responsible for the growth and continuation of the Hindu-Muslim bitterness, have been discussed. Many of these cause. are still present and working actively to perpetuate the differences. Those factors which have become rather 'old' and have consequently no sting in them, have, however, their effects ever present and it cannot be denied that these will continue for a long time to come.

But side by side with this atmosphere of distrust and bitterness, attempts at 'unity' for the evolution of a common Hindu-Muslim brotherhood, were also made. Readers are aware how Emperor Akbar made such an attempt long ago through his artificial religion *Din-i-Ilahi* and how with the death of Akbar his socalled religion also met a natural death. Kabir, Nanak, Dadu and Chaitanya also tried to bring about

such a common understanding through the medium of religion ; but without any appreciable success. In fact, Hinduism and Islam are so different from one another that to evolve a common formula between the two is simply impossible and, that is why, all such attempts at religious unification failed very miserably as was natural.

After that for a long time there were no such attempts. Then, with the introduction of democratic ideas the people became more and more politically conscious and with that attempts at poiitical 'unity' were started afresh. But these attempts for political 'unity' also ultimately proved to be futile, only for the reason that these were based on the wrong notion of 'one nationhood', which is, in fact, non-existent in India.

The most important achievement of political 'unity' was witnessed during the Non-Cooperation and Khilafat movement days. In fact, a kind of 'unity' was really established at that time and for a short period the Indian sky was rent with the simultaneous cries of *Bande-Mataram* and *Allaho-Akbar*. But as the basis of this 'unity' was not, at all, a strong one and both the communities were drawn together only for temporary ends, this 'unity' could not last long.

After the abolition of the *Khilafat* by the Turkish people themselves and Gandhijee's confession of the Himalayan Blunder, both the communities again divided themselves into two separate camps and the unreal 'unity' died a natural death. Even after that many Conferences and Conventions were organised to 'devise ways and means for a lasting unity' between the communities. But all these also ultimately proved to be fruitless.

Why these attempts failed so miserably ? What was the cause of these repeated failures ? Because, our leaders, both Hindu and Muslim, did not know their minds and consequently they approached the problem from a wrong angle. Everyone of them was thinking in the terms of 'united India' and 'one nationhood' and all their attempts were based on these two unreal fundamentals.

The inevitable, therefore, happened. Where diversity is the law of nature, how can 'unity' succeed there ?

* * *

The Hindu-Muslim problem, accordingly, remained unsolved and it will remain so as long as it is not approached from the right angle—the recognition of the 'diversity' which is in existence. In fact, this

is a fit case of 'unity in diversity'. Accept the truth that the Hindus and the Muslims are two distinct and separate peoples with their separate cultures, civilisations, customs, usages, literatures, languages, religions, laws, history and traditions—in short, everything intensely individual, and you will see that the much-talked-of Hindu-Muslim problem is solved, and solved for ever.

IV

PAKISTAN—THE ONLY SOLUTION.

In the course of the preceding chapters we have discussed the subject at length and the following points have been established :

1. That India is not one, was not one and will never be so. The historical evidences, geographical and climatic conditions, racial diversities, differences with regard to culture and civilisation, varities of language and script, religious groupings and also heterogeneity with regard to dress, diet and living conditions in various regions and of different peoples, conclusively prove that the theory of 'united India' and 'one nationhood' does not, at all, apply in this land of ours. In fact, India is a vast sub-continent comprising so many different independent regions inhabited by separate peoples.

2. That the Hindus and the Muslims are not one people, but are two distinct and separate nations, like nations of Europe and other countries. Both these nations—the Hindus and the Muslims—have their separate culture and civilisation, history and tradition, ambition and aptitude, art and architecture,

customs and calendar, legal laws and moral codes, conceptions of religion and spiritual life. In short, the outlook of both the nations on life and of life is quite different from one another. By any definition or test of a nation the Hindus and the Muslims are undoubtedly two major nations of India.

3. That the Hindu-Muslim Problem is the creation of British imperialism. For their own benefit British statesmen invented the myth of 'united India' and 'one nationhood' and, thus, put the Hindus and the Muslims together, in the hope that these two separate elements will not be able to live together peacefully and hence they—our foreign masters—will have a plea for remaining in this country as our guardian arbitrators for all time to come. The Hindu-Muslim problem is the natural outcome of the artificial 'one nation' theory and, therefore, with the recognition of the fact that these two peoples belong to two separate nations, the problem of Hindu-Muslim disputes will no more exist.

From the above naturally the following questions arise. Firstly, while India is not one and was not so in any respect, what is the harm if according to

the demands of the time, political sanction is also accorded for the partition of India into the Pakistan and Hindustan states ?

Secondly, while it has been proved that in no way the Hindus and the Muslims can be considered to be component parts of a single nation and on the contrary both have their peculiar characteristics so as to be called two separate nations, why don't we gather moral courage and recognise the truth of 'two nations' ?

And, thirdly, while because of the clash of ideals and interests, the Hindu-Muslim problem has become insoluble, will it not be more sensible to separate the two and thus solve the problem for good ?

We shall have to ponder over these questions and decide. The verdict of Mr. Jinnah, our leader, is quite clear in this respect. He says :

> "Pakistan and Hindustan are the only just solutions of India's constitutional problem, which will lead to peace, prosperity and happiness of the two major communities and others inhabiting this vast sub-continent."*

* Interview granted to the Associated Press of India, in Calcutta, on 20-2-46.

In fact, there is no other solution of India's problems and there cannot be any except through Pakistan and Hindustan. India's biggest problem is its slavery, which can only be removed if the Hindus and the Muslims can combine and present a united front. For such a united front, again, Hindu-Muslim understanding or solution of the communal tangle is necessary, which cannot be accomplished unless separate nationhood of both the communities is recognised. This recognition of separate nationhood of the Hindus and the Muslims can only be consumated through Pakistan and Hindustan and, therefore, it can be said without doubt that if we are really serious for the well-being of this land of ours and its peoples, we have no other alternative but to accept the principle of Pakistan and Hindustan.

We have previously said that Pakistan is not anything new, it means nothing but recognition of the lawful shares of the Hindus and the Muslims in this land of their abode. Nobody can deny the fact that both the Hindus and the Muslims, as common inhabitants of this land, are like joint partners of a property. Now, as it has been proved by facts that both these parties—the Hindus and

the Muslims—are no more willing to continue as 'joint partners', we shall have only to decide which community is entitled to what portion of the land and how to the best advantage of both the communities the partition can be effected.

The Muslims demand a fourth of the country according to their numerical strength and they wish that this share of one-fourth should comprise both the north-western and eastern zones of their national homelands, where on account of their numerical superiority over all the other communities they can justly claim the right of full self-determination. While they are for the establishment of Pakistan states comprising one-fourth part of the country, the Muslims are also for the establishment of Hindustan State in the remaining three-fourths area ; they have no objection in allowing the Hindus the right of their national self-determination in those parts of the country where they predominate.

But unfortunately the Hindu community has taken a very selfish attitude in this respect. Their political leaders and the Congress, which is a predominently Hindu organisation, are still clamouring for a 'united India' with a single central government for it, so that an indirect Hindu-Raj may be estabiished

all over the country. The Muslims cannot agree to such a proposition. Because, how can they be a party to an arrangement which will mean nothing but changing of masters from the English to the Hindu ? They cannot and, therefore, no agreed solution in this respect can be expected. What is the way out then ? Let us quote the opinion of a foreigner, Mr. R. Hopkins Morris M. P. Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Delegation, which visited this country recently. He said :

> "Pakistan is the only way out in the absence of an agreed solution."*

Even a person like Rev. R. Sorensen, Socialist member of Parliament, who is considered to be a pro-Congress Englishman, after a close study of the Indian situation as a member of the Parliamentary Delegation, was compelled to declare :

> "I admit there is a powerful case for Pakistan. There are instances in history that when a community is persecuted, it would like to settle in areas where it has a majority and live a life of freedom and happiness." †

---

* Interview granted to a representative of the Press at the Willingdon Aerodrome, Delhi, on the eve of departure of the Delegation for London.

† Ibid.

The story of systematic suppression and persecution of the Muslims in India is a well-established fact. Not only were they persecuted in the early days of British rule and in post-Mutiny years ; but even now their rights and interests are being shamelessly ignored and suppressed almost everywhere. It is, therefore, not at all unnatural that they, as a persecuted community, will like to have their independent 'national homelands' in those parts of the country where they predominate. But this is not a question of mere liking. Pakistan is a life and death question for the Muslims, they must either have it or perish ; there is no via-media.

And here is the verdict of George Bernard Shaw, the intellectual giant of the age. While answering a series of questions submitted by a news-paper correspondent, he expressed his opinion about Pakistan in the following manner :

> "It (Pakistan) is national and natural, like Ulster in my native country. Do not wrangle about it ; give it a trial."*

But how to achieve this 'national' and 'natural' goal of a hundred million Muslims of India ? According to our great leader Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the way

* A. P. A. message, dated March 28, 1946.

to this goal lies in 'unity' and 'continued struggle' of our people. His message to the Muslims :

> "If you go on struggling as a united body, I have no doubt in my mind that you will win. In fact, there is something in our blood which will never make us take defeat. We are determined to win and we shall win."*

Yes, we shall win, certainly the victory will be ours. Six years ago Pakistan was only a dream, today it is a practical proposition and tomorrow, *Insha-Allah,* it will turn into an accomplished fact and, with that, all the problems of India will automatically be solved for all time to come.

* Speech delivered at the All-India Muslim Railways Employees' Association, on 12-2-46.

V

THE SHAPE OF PAKISTAN.

The question why Pakistan has become a necessity—an essential proposition—has been answered at length and as factually as possible. After that practically nothing else concerning our subject matter, which is limited to the "why" only, remains for discussion. But many of our readers will, perhaps, be eager also to know 'what' Pakistan will look like, what practical shape it is likely to take, when partition will become an accomplished fact. Only to satisfy the curiosity of such readers this chapter, though beyond the purview of this book, has incidentally been added.

The Lahore resolution of the Muslim League expresses only the 'principle' of Pakistan, while the 'shape of Pakistan' is a matter of detail. The first and foremost question is the acceptance of the 'principle' and only after its acceptance the question of settling of details will naturally arise. But such a stage has not yet come and, therefore, to examine the details at this stage will be rather premature. But be that as it may, it cannot be denied

that every individual has the right to think and express his or her views over this most important matter. Many have done so through the numerous schemes for India's Constitutional Reform pubiished so far. And, incidentally, this may also be mentioned that the present author too published one such scheme some years ago, which was based on the principle of Confederation. But that is an old story. Let us add one more ; this time strictly confining ourselves to the Lahore resolution of the Muslim League.

Three Independent States.

As proposed, British India will be divided into the following three fully independent and sovereign states :

1. Muslim Pakistan State of the north-western zone, comprising the present provinces of Sindh, the Punjab, North-West Frontier and Beluchistan.
2. Muslim Pakistan State of the eastern zone, comprising the present provinces of Bengal and Assam. Arakan region of Burma, which is a Muslim majority area, may also be included in this State.
3. Hindustan State, comprising all the remaining provinces.

It is needless to point out that while making such divisions, readjustment of Provincial boundaries will have to be made where necessary. To show how such readjustments can be effected, it can be mentioned that it might be necessary to transfer the entire Burdwan Division of Bengal into the Hindustan State, while the Purnea district of Behar and Arakan of Burmah will, in the like manner, become parts of the Muslim Pakistan State of the eastern zone.

As stated, these States will be fully independent and sovereign and in no way will they be inter-dependent or dependent on any outside influence. Treaties of mutual friendship and collaboration and agreements on other matters of common interest will exist between the States. This is, again, necessary to make it clear that both the Pakistan States will also be separate independent and sovereign States and mutual relations between them will be governed by such treaties and agreements.

North-Western Muslim State.

The Muslim State which will be formed in the north-western zone, may be named Pakistan. Its national flag will be of green colour and on that green back-ground a white crescent with four stars, each

star representing one participating province, will be depicted.

The constitution of this Pakistan State will be of a Federal nature, the four participating provinces being units of the Federation. Headquarters of this Federation may be located at Lahore or Karachi, whichever is found more convenient.

The supreme Head of the Federal Government will be an elected President and he will have his Cabinet of Ministers, chosen from among the members of the Federal Parliament. The Federal Parliament will be an elected body, say, with 70 members—30 from the Punjab, 15 from Sindh, 15 from N. W. F. and 10 from Beluchistan. These members of the Federal Parliament will be elected by territorial constituencies constituted in various parts of all the four Provinces. The President of the Federation will be elected by the votes of the members of the Provincial Legislatures and it will, perhaps, be convenient if his term of office extends up to 5 years.

Defence, foreign affairs, currency, custom, exchange, excise, communications and transport (Railways, Waterways, Air-transport, Post and Telegraphs, Radio etc.), inter-provincial relations and other such matters of a central nature will be Federal subjects.

The Federation will have its independent Army, Navy and Air-force and recruitment to these Defence Services will be open to all inhabitants of the four participating Provinces, without any reservation what-so-ever. All the three Defence Services will be under a Commander-in-Chief, who will also act as Defence Minister of the President's Cabinet.

There will also be a Federal Bank like the present Reserve Bank of India. The currency and the fiscal policy of the Government will be conducted by this Bank, of course, according to the advice of the Minister of the Exchequer.

The Federal Government will not, generally, interfere with the internal administration of the Provinces. But in the matter of inter-provincial disputes, the Federal Government will have full power to take such steps as may be necessary. Protection of the interests of minorities will also be another special Federal responsibility.

This is, in a nutshell, what the Pakistan Federal Government will be like. Other details of the constitution will have to be worked-out by the Constitution-making body.

Provincial Governments.

Now, we shall deal with the Constitution of Federal units, i. e. the Provinces in the Pakistan State.

Every Province will have as its administrative Head one Governor, who will be elected by the votes of the members of Provincial Councils. The term of office of a Governor will generally be 5 years. With the help of a Cabinet of Ministers, who will be chosen from among the members of the Provincial Council, the Governor will run the administration of the Province. The Provincial Council will be an elected body like the present Legislative Assemblies and its members will be elected from territorial constituencies by popular votes, on the widest possible basis.

With regard to all internal affairs, Provincial Governments will be fully autonomous. Provincial revenues will be derived from sources other than those specially marked Federal. Top-heaviness of the Provincial expenditure, as at present, will have to be remedied and, when that is done, more money will be available for nation-building works, such as, education, agriculture, industry, village-improvement and the like.

Eastern Muslim State.

The independent and sovereign Muslim State, which will be formed in the eastern zone, comprising Bengal and Assam and Muslim majority areas of Arakan (which will become a part of Bengal), may be named Bangsam, a combination of the names of both the provinces. Some people are in favour of naming it as Eastern Pakistan ; but while Pakistan of the north-western zone will be a quite separate independent and sovereign State with no direct connection with this eastern Muslim State, excepting some treaty obligations and agreements, we do not see any reason of adopting such a name which will, at least outwardly, indicate 'oneness' of both the States.

The national flag of this eastern Muslim state will also be of green colour with a white crescent and only two stars, representing Bengal and Assam. The Headquarters of this State will, perhaps, be located in Calcutta, with Shillong as Summer Capital.

The constitution of this State will also be of the Federal type and a President, elected by the votes of the members of Provincial Councils, will be the supreme Head of this Government. The President will have his Cabinet of Ministers chosen from among the members of the Federal Parliament. The Federal

Parliament will be an elected body, composed of, say, 80 members—50 from Bengal and 30 from Assam. Members of the Parliament will be elected from territorial constituencies. The term of office of the President and also of the Parliament will be 5 years, as in the Pakistan State of north-western zone.

As has been stated in connection with the the north-western Pakistan State, the defence, foreign affairs, currency, exchange, custom, excise, communications and transport, inter-provincial matters etc. will be Federal subjects. Bangsam State will also have its independent Army, Navy and Air-forces under a Commandar-in-Chief. A Federal Bank will also have to be established to deal with currency and the fiscal policy of this Federal Government.

In short, this Federal Government of the eastern Muslim State of Bangsam will be a fully independent State like Pakistan of the north-west, with similar arrangements of administration.

The provincial Governments of Bengal and Assam will also be like provincial Goverments of the Punjab, Sindh and other provinces of the Pakistan State, as has been already stated. In short, Bengal and Assam will also have their elected Governors, Cabinets of

The religious and cultural life of the minorities will also be protected and they will have their legitimate share in the public services.

Of the minorities, the Sikhs of the Punjab will, perhaps, present some difficulties. A section of them wants to establish a Sikhistan in the Punjab. But if the numerical strength of this community is considered, such a proposal becomes impracticable. If they are really serious of having their own 'Raj', they can easily settle in Patiala or Nabha States and, thus, may have full opportunities of developing their own culture and civilisation under two Sikh Rajas.

Exchange Of Nationals.

With the establishment of Pakistan and Hindustan States, the question of exchange of nationals between the provinces will, naturally, come to the fore-front. Of course, there will be safe-guards for the minorities ; but there will still be a section of people—both Hindus and Muslims—who will prefer to leave their homes and resettle in areas where their own community, as majority people, will be holding the power of administration in their hands. There will be nothing in the Constitution to prevent such migrations ; on

the contrary optional exchange of nationals will have to be encouraged.

The Problem Of Native States.

What will be the position of Native States after the acceptance of the principle of Pakistan and Hindustan? This question is being raised from various quarters. But it must be borne in mind that the principle of Pakistan and Hindustan concerns only British India, it has nothing to do with the Princely India. In fact, even at present these Native States have no connection with the Central Government of British India; with regard to internal affairs they are fully independent and autonomous.

Where the position is such, what is the harm if these States also join the Federation of Hindustan or Pakistan or Bangsam as autonomous 'units' like the Provinces? Of course, this will be optional on the part of the Princes and when any Prince decides to use this option, he will have to join that particular Federation which will be geographically contiguous to his State. As for example, if Kashmir decides to join the Federation, it will have to join the Pakistan State, while the Nizam's Dominions will have no other alternative but to join the Hindustan State, if it decides

to be a unit of the Federal system of Government. Rulers of such participating Native States will be considered like Governors of participating Provinces and they will be at liberty to rule over their subjects unhampered and without any interference from the Federal Government. Of course, in place of the old-type autocratic rule popular legislative bodies will have to be formed in most of the major States.

Other details concerning the internal administration of participating Native States, will have to be worked out later on.

Potentialities Of Pakistan.

What is the future of Pakistan? Will the separated Pakistan States be powerful enough as independent sovereign States or, in the words of Gandhijee "will become a collection of poor States, a menace to themselves and to the rest of India?"* Such a question is a common weapon of attack against the demand for Pakistan by the Muslims. We shall try to answer this question, not merely by sentimental words, but by citing real facts.

At the very beginning let us declare with confidence that the future of Pakistan is not at all gloomy

* Gandhi-Jinnah letters, 1944.

and none of the Pakistan States will, in any way, be a 'poor' State. On the contrary, if considered from the points of man-power and area, both the States will be much more better-placed than many of the first class European powers. Let us quote some latest census figures :

	Area (sq miles)	Population
Pakistan State of eastern zone	132,373	70,511,258
Pakistan State of north-western zone	215,944	36,493,525
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	94,633	46,064,000
Germany ...	472,605	69,622,483
Austria	88,226	7,009,014
Eire ...	27,000	2,989,000
Albania ...	10,629	1,003,124

These figures show that with regard to man-power, which is the real strength of a nation, the position of the eastern Muslim State of Pakistan (Bangsam) will be far better than that of mighty Great Britain and also Germany, who was till recently the terror of the whole world. Figures quoted above are, of course, of Bengal and Assam as constituted at present. If due to

readjustment of boundaries Burdwan Division goes to Hindustan and Purnea and Arakan come under the jurisdiction of the Muslim State of Bangsam, even then the population of this State will be well over 60 millions. The north-western State of Pakistan will also be almost equal to Great Britain, excluding Northern Ireland, and if compared with Austria it will be five times more powerful.

There is another aspect of the position to be considered If smaller States like Albania and Eire with a population of only one million and less than three millions respectively, can continue as independent sovereign States, there cannot be any reasonable cause to be pessimistic about the future of the Pakistan States, with a population of more than sixty and thirty-six millions respectively. With regard to area also, as will be proved by the figures quoted, both the Pakistan States will be much bigger than many of the great European powers.

Then, the question of resources is also to be considered. It is a known fact that Pakistan States will be two great centres of agricultural produce, Bengal and Assam being a main rice-producing region, while Sindh, the Punjab and N. W. F. being improtant wheat-producing areas. Again, the question

of jute, which will be a monopoly produce of the eastern zone of Pakistan and that of cotton, one of the principal produces of the north-western Pakistan area, are of special consideration. Tea will also be an important produce of the Pakistan States. Coal is another very important mineral product of Bengal and if, as a result of readjustment of boundaries, coal-fields of Burdwan district become the property of Hindustan State, even then the eastern zone of Pakistan will have some coal-fields in Assam and Darjeeling areas. In Assam alone, as many as five coal-fields have, so far, been located and in some places raising of coal has been already started. Expart opinion on the subject is that the deposits of coal in this area are immense and will be sufficient for all the future requirements of the eastern Muslim State of Bangsam. The oil-fields of Assam are also specially mentionable in this respect. Both the Pakistan States will also have inexhaustible quantities of iron-ore.

With regard to raw materials for industrial purposes, it is needless to point out that both the Pakistan States will be, by nature, rich enough and if attempts are made it will not be very diflicult to widely industrialise them. In this connection, the

scope of hydro-electric power being generated from the waters of the Indus, Brahmaputra and Meghna, is of special importance.

The Pakistan States will have three important ports—Karachi, Calcutta and Chittagong—and, as such, it can reasonably be expected that they will have ample opportunites of extending their foreign trade and thereby to enrich themselves more and more.

In short, we find no cause for pessimism about the future of Pakistan. On the contrary, the real facts foretell a great future, full of immense possibilities, for both the proposed Muslim States.

Studies in Indo-Muslim History (A Critical Commentary on Elliot and Dowson's History of India as told by its own Historians by Shahpurshah Hormasji Hodivala in 2 Volumes.
Economic History of Pakistan by Dr. Anwar Iqbal Qureshi
Pakistan Movement : Historic Documents by G. Allana
Why Pakistan by Bashir Ahmad Dar
Secrets of Ego (An English translation of Allama Iqbal's *Asrar-i-Khudi*) by A. R. Tariq
Secrets of Collective Life (An English translation of Allama Iqbal's *Rumuz-e-Bekhudi*) by A. R. Tariq
Iqbal's Philosophy of Religion by Dr. Mohammed Maruf
Contributions to Iqbal's Thought by Dr. Mohammed Maruf
Some Aspects of Iqbal's Thought by Asif Iqbal Khan
The Politics of Iqbal by Riaz Hussain
The Poet's Vision & Magic of Words (An Approach to Iqbal's Poetry) by Prof. Muhammad Iqbal
A Bibliography of Articles on Iqbal (1900-1977) by Malik Mueem Nawaz Azhar
Modern Muslim Cooking of Indo-Pakistan by A. Nisa Bhatti
Sag-e-Awara by Sadiq Hedayat (Iran), translated into Urdu by Bazl-i-Haque Mahmud

Islamic Book Service

PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS

40-A, Urdu Bazar, Lahore (PAKISTAN)

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Bases of Islamic Culture by Syed Abdul Latif

Islam the Ideal Religion by Prof. S. Youssef El-Digwy

The Renaissance of Islam by S. Khuda Bakhsh

The Mystics of Islam by R. A. Nicholson

Economic and Social System of Islam by Dr. Anwar Iqbal Qureshi

Islam aur Sood (*Urdu*) by Dr. Anwar Iqbal Qureshi

Virtues of the Holy Qur'an (*Fazail-i-Qur'an*) by Maulana Muhammad Zakaria

Stories of Sahabah (*Hikayat-e-Sahabah*) by Maulana Muhammad Zakaria

The Benefactor (An English translation of *Mohsin-e-Azam and Mohsanin*) by Faqir Syed Waheed-ud-Din

A Dictionary and Glossary of the Qur'an by John Penrice

A Critical Appreciation of Arabic Mystical Poetry by Dr Sadiq Hussain Nadeem

Islam as an Ethical & a Political Ideal by Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, edited with Critical Introduction, Copious Notes and Appendix by Dr. S. Y. Hashimy

The Life of Saladin (Salah-ud-Din Ayubi) by Beha Ed-Din

Hazrat Amir Khusrau of Delhi by Muhammad Habib

Akbar and the Rise of the Mughal Empire by Col. G. B. Malleson

Akbar-Nama of Abul Fazl by Sir H. M. Elliot

Memoirs of Jahangir by Sir H. M. Elliot

History of Tipu Sultan by Mir Husain Ali Khan Kirmani, translated from Persian by Col. W. Miles

The History of India as told by its own Historians (Muhammadan Period) by Sir H. M. Elliot & John Dowson in 8 Volumes

SOME PRESS OPINIONS

DAWN (Delhi) :

"The author has laid bare with an array of facts and figures the 'Myth of United India'. The sections on 'Racial differences', 'Cultural diversity', 'Language and script', 'Religious differences', 'Dress, diet and mode of living' are convincing, because they present a wealth of historical, cultural and sociological data instead of mere opinions. In the chapter on the "Two Nations Theory" the author proves the thesis to the hilt. In the chapter "The Shape of Pakistan" all the arguments advanced against Pakistan on 'practical grounds' are examined and convincingly met......"

ILLUSTRATED WEEKLY OF INDIA (Bombay) :

"Why does the vast majority of Muslims think that Pakistan is the only solution for the ills of India ? And why do they believe that this is the only way of securing independence for the country ? These are only some of the questions answered by the author in his book "Why Pakistan".

Mr. Rahman says : "India is not one, was not one and will never be so," and then goes on to point out the racial diversities, differences with regard to culture and civilisation, varieties of language and script religious groupings, different dress, diet and living conditions, separate art and architecture. And he concludes by emphatically stating that there is no other solution of India's problems except through Pakistan and Hindustan."

MORNING NEWS (Calcutta) :

"This book is a happy addition to the increasing volume of Pakistan literature......The author has delt very lucidly in the first chapter, with the 'Myth of United India' and its alleged "historical evidence"......In the second chapter he makes out a good case for the "Two Nations Theory" in regard to Hinduism and Islam as representing two distinct, divergent, and separate civilisations. "The Hindu-Muslim Problems" are also discussed with analysis of the British "divide and rule" policy......"

AZAD (Calcutta) :

"This book is the newest addition to the Pakistan literature. The author, Mr. Rahman, has proved with various arguments and facts that the only solution of India's problems lies in the division of India between the Hindus and the Muslims......We hope, the book will be widely circulated throughout India and specially in the Eastern Pakistan zone......"

MILLAT (Calcutta) :

"The author, through various arguments and historical evidences, has proved convincingly the necessity of Pakistan and why the establishment of Pakistan has become an essential proposition...... The style of the book is lucid. The author knows the art of expressing his ideas and establishing a theme through the medium of a simple language......"

MOHAMMADI (Calcutta) :

"Except through Pakistan why the solution of India's problems is not possible, the author has very ably proved this theme in this book by citing innumerable historical and other evidences......Mr. Husseyn Shaheed Suhrawardy, the Premier of Bengal, has written a Foreword for the book, in course of which he has remarked : "I commend it to those who wish to know the case for Pakistan." We fully endorse his opinion".